

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 4 to 7 remain in the case.

With this amendment, Applicant has made the amendments to the claims objected to under 35 U.S.C. 112 in order to provide proper antecedent basis for the various terms.

With respect to Claim 3, it is not believed that the recitation therein is a method step. Rather, this phrase is believed to merely lend support to the apparatus definition of liquid feeding means. In this respect, it will be noted that Claim 3 is now being incorporated in Claim 1.

Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the rotational axis of the ring is substantially horizontal. This definition, along with the incorporation of the subject matter of old Claim 3, is believed to clearly and patentably define over the prior art.

In the Office Action, old Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Markovets et al in view of Knappe et al. In this regard, Knappe et al discloses an arrangement wherein containers are rotated horizontally (the opposite to the instant application) and a conventional type of irrigation system is employed. The teachings of Markovets are the dipping of the containers at the bottom of the wheel into a source of liquid. It is not seen where there is any teaching which would lead one to the practice of the present invention.

Claim 7 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of old Claim 9. As old Claim 9 was indicated to be allowable, it is now believed that Claim 7 is allowable.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in order for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully,




Eric Fincham
Reg. No. 28,201

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as Express Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents and Trademark, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 3, 2006

Express Mail ED 428052984 US


Eric Fincham, Reg. 28,201

Date May 3, 2006